



EDITORIAL

The rewards of peer-reviewing

Pediatric Research (2020) 87:2; <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41390-019-0573-7>

Peer review is defined as “a process of subjecting an author’s scholarly work, research or ideas to the scrutiny of others who are experts in the same field.”¹ Peer review aims to ensure the highest standards and quality of research and assist researchers in improving the quality of their papers.

Two recent events at *Pediatric Research* deserve mention. The first involved an editor requesting 27 potential reviewers to find 1 that actually did a review. This effort instigated the creation of the *Pediatric Research* Tenacity Award to be given to any editor who exceeds 25 requests to review before finding a single reviewer. Secondly, Maintenance of Certification (MOC) Part 2 points became available for completing an adequate review for *Pediatric Research*. The first event demonstrates the need to highlight the rewards of reviewing so that more members of the *Pediatric Research* family agree to review. The second event is an example of some of the rewards reviewers can expect. Therefore, this editorial will serve to highlight the rewards of reviewing!

It is increasingly recognized that the scientific enterprise relies heavily on quality peer-reviewing. Yet this activity is not rewarded monetarily or publicly as either reward, it is feared, would influence the quality of the review. However, there are some movements afoot to provide appropriate rewards.

The first to mention is the creation of Publons (www.publons.com). Realizing how little reviewers are rewarded, the creators of Publons set out to improve recognition of peer review. They designed an organization that records, verifies and organizes an individual’s peer review activity with the intent of making one’s peer review activities an important aspect of one’s scientific stature such that employers, funders and promotion committees will use the data to make decisions. The organized list of peer reviews can be used for job hunting, funding applications and promotion materials. It is easy to use and maintain and registration is free!

The second reward, particularly for maintenance of certification by the American Board of Pediatrics (ABP), is the awarding of MOC part 2 credits for a review that meets certain standards. This credit offsets the need to perform other ABP requirements needed to receive Part 2 credits, such as reading and answering questions on the highlighted papers within one’s field. For academics, the

ability to read articles that are likely to be published in a month or two is a way of staying ahead of the field rather than reading an article that has already been published and most likely discussed ad nauseum within one’s own division. *Pediatric Research* is proud to announce that we will be offering MOC part 2 credits to reviewers who review our original science papers!

The third reward, as mentioned above, is to stay ahead of the game when reviewing papers of quality science in one’s own area of research. It is a privilege to see these confidential papers weeks before publication. Reviewing and providing suggestions for improvement is a way to influence the direction of the field as very few other opportunities are available.

The fourth reward is to be a member of a group consisting of academic physician-scientists who have achieved membership in one of our three learned societies, whose principles urge us to participate in conducting high- quality science, not just our own science, but those of our colleagues and peers whose work will only be improved by our reviews. Reviewing is a moral mandate to be a full member of our societies. So this year let us ensure that no one earns the *Pediatric Research* Tenacity Award!

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Competing interests: The authors declare no competing interests.

Publisher’s note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Cynthia F. Bearer¹, Lina Chalak², Elena Fuentes-Afflick³ and Eleanor J. Molloy⁴

¹University of Maryland, Pediatrics, Baltimore, MA, USA; ²Department of Pediatrics, University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center, Dallas, TX, USA; ³San Francisco General Hospital, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA and ⁴University of Dublin Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland

Correspondence: Cynthia F. Bearer (cbearer@som.umaryland.edu)

REFERENCE

1. Kelly, J., Sadeghieh, T. & Adeli, K. Peer review in scientific publications: benefits, critiques, & a survival guide. *EJIFCC* **25**, 227–243 (2014).